

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

criminate between them?¹ These two last verses might very reasonably be the work of a redactor, and, had the subjective critics asserted that this was so, no one would have been hardy enough to contradict them. But they have insisted that these words are specially characteristic of P. Consequently we are driven to the conclusion that the redactor here is not in his preternaturally acute, but in his normally feeble and inconsequent, mood—a mood in which he saw nothing absurd in taking a considerable amount of his genealogical details from one author, and then adding the summary of details, which he had *not* given, from the pages of another.

J. J. LIAS.



ART. II.—THE HISTORY OF THE WORDS OF ADMINISTRATION IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

THE history of the words in which the elements in the Holy Communion have from time to time been distributed to the faithful must always have an interest for Christian people. Three of the Evangelists, as well as St. Paul, have been careful to record the sacred words with which our Lord originally blessed and distributed the bread and wine. We can have no doubt that in their writings we possess, at least in substance, the very words used on the occasion. We take St. Paul's language in the First Epistle to the Corinthians as being the fullest, and also as being incorporated into our own Communion Office. "The Lord Jesus the same night on which He was betrayed took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is My body, which is [broken] for you: this do in remembrance of Me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 23-25). As to the question raised by some, Did our Lord repeat these words to each of the Apostles separately? we consider it a profitless inquiry. The probability is in favour of one solemn asseveration and blessing, and then a silent distribution. It is to be remembered that at the moment our Lord was at once Speaker, Giver, and Gift. There needed no repetition of the words; it was all too real and too overwhelming. When we pass on from the upper chamber into history, as given to us in the Acts of the

¹ My meaning is this, if I have not made it sufficiently clear in the text. The words "these are the generations," etc., if taken from P, would naturally follow the genealogy P had given. They would hardly be appended by any editor or redactor in the world, however abnormally eccentric, to a genealogy extracted from another author.

Apostles, we are absolutely without a clue. It is a remarkable fact that, for the time being, we lose all mention of the cup, the bread alone is mentioned; but if we were tempted to draw the conclusion that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was at the time only administered in one element, the Apostle St. Paul saves us from the danger, as he distinctly mentions the cup likewise. The probability is that "the breaking of the bread" was the generic name for the Sacrament, and covered the administration in both elements. When we pass out of the region of inspired history, the first reference we get to the administration of the Holy Communion is that given by Justin Martyr in his well-known account of the service, and here we are told nothing as to the form of words after which the elements were distributed. He tells us this only: "There is brought to the president by the brethren bread, and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the Universe, through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks . . . and when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen . . . and those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced" (Justin's "Apology," ch. lxx. : Administration of the Sacraments). In the next chapter (of the Eucharist) Justin virtually repeats himself. He speaks of "the prayer of His word," which seems to suggest a repetition of our Lord's words at the first distribution, but nothing more. The early Fathers who follow, in their references to the Holy Communion, throw no light on this particular question. Tertullian speaks of the "Amen," which probably followed some words of administration. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the chanter who invites them to receive, saying, "O taste and see how gracious the Lord is." He also speaks of the "Amen" after reception, likewise hinting at some form of words ("Catech. Mystag.," v. 20-22).

It is when we come to the "Apostolic Constitutions" that for the first time we meet with an express form of words in the administration: "Let the bishop minister the oblation (*προσφοράν*), saying, 'the body of Christ,' and let him that receiveth say 'Amen'; and let the deacon hold the cup, and say as he administers, 'the blood of Christ,' 'the cup of life,' and let him that drinketh say 'Amen.'" The Liturgy of St. James neither in the Greek nor Syriac version gives any form of words. In the Liturgy of St. Mark the administration of the bread to the clergy is accompanied with the simple words "the holy body," and with the cup the words "the precious

blood of our Lord, and God, and Saviour." It is probable that the same formulas were repeated in the case of the communicating of the laity.

The Byzantine or St. Chrysostom's Liturgy is much more full and ornate. The priest, taking the holy bread, gives it to the deacon, who, saluting the priest's hand, says, "Impart to me, sir, the precious and holy body of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ." And the priest replies, "To N. is imparted the precious and holy and undefiled body of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of sins and life eternal." The rubric following directs the administration of the Sacrament to all who desire to communicate: "The servant of God partakes of the precious and holy body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for forgiveness of his sins and life eternal."

Coming to the Western Church, we find Gregory the Great using the form "Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu. Christi conservet animam tuam." For the communion of the laity the "Missa Illyrici" provides the words, "Corpus et sanguis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi prosit tibi in remissionem omnium peccatorum et ad vitam æternam."¹ Another form of words was provided for priests and deacons. "About the time of Charles the Great the following was a common formula: 'Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam æternam'" (Krazer, "De Liturgiis," quoted by Professor Cheetham in Smith's "Dict. Christ. Antiq.," vol. i., p. 415). According to the Ambrosian Rite, the priest said simply, "the body of Christ," and the communicant briefly responded, "Amen, it is the true" (body) (*id est verum*).

From this retrospect we gather that from the earliest times the elements were given to each communicant separately at the same time that the words of which we have illustration above were also spoken, and that at first the formula was of the simplest character.² Each communicant had thus the gift of grace pledged to him so far as the Church could outwardly do it. The words of delivery were spoken to each in the singular number. A strange and frightful exception to primitive usage is to be found in the action of Novatian, who, instead of using the well-known words, exacted a promise that the communicant would not forsake him and return to Cornelius, Bishop of

¹ Given in the Appendix to Cardinal Bona, "De Rebus Liturgicis," tom. iii., App., p. xxvii.

² The form at first seems to have been no more than this: "The body of Christ" and "the blood of Christ," to each of which the people subjoined "Amen"; or, as we have it in the Clementine Liturgy, "the body of Christ. Amen"; "the blood of Christ, the cup of life. Amen." (Bingham, book xv., chap. v., § 8.)

Rome.¹ In the Roman Missal, as in those of Salisbury, York and Hereford, there is no form for communicating the laity, nor, in fact, any form of distribution whatever; but it would be a mistake to conclude from this that no form of words was used. The present use in the Roman Catholic Church, we understand, is to say the same formula to the people as the priest uses in communicating himself and his brother priests, the pronoun being changed as required. We find Benedict XIV., in his treatise "De Sacro Sancto Missæ Sacrificio," saying, "Tum unicuique porriget sacramentum faciens cum eo signum crucis supra pyxidem et singulis dicit: Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam æternam. Amen." In the well-known devotional treatise of the Roman Catholic Church, "The Garden of the Soul" (p. 255), we find these words: "When the priest gives you the Blessed Sacrament, saying, The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul to life everlasting, Amen, receive it with a lively faith." The rule of the Church of Rome is also clearly ascertained from the canons of several of the councils. For example, the second canon of the Council of Rome requires: "Nulli autem laico aut feminae Eucharistiam in manibus ponat, sed tantum in os ejus cum his verbis ponat: Corpus Domini et Sanguis prosit tibi ad remissionem peccatorum et ad vitam æternam" (Martene, "De Ritibus," lib. i. c. iv.).

We come now to the changes enacted in this matter at the Reformation, and we cannot feel sufficiently thankful for the clear and indisputable doctrine which they enshrined in our English formularies. From the first no doubt was left as to the object of the Holy Communion—it was for reception. No loophole was left for the future whereby celebrations of the Lord's Supper could be turned into solitary Masses to be said by the priest alone. In the first instance it was required that a certain number should be present and receive at each celebration, and next the words of distribution to be said to each communicant were distinctly set down. In this respect alone there was a clear gain on the mediæval missals. In the earliest order for the Communion, that of 1548, the direction to the celebrant runs as follows: "And when he doth deliver the Sacrament of the body of Christ, he shall say to every one these words following: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life.' And the priest delivering the Sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once, and no more, shall say:

¹ ὁμοσὸν μοι κατὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ μηδέποτε με καταλιπεῖν καὶ επιστρέψαν πρὸς κορνήλιον. καὶ ὁ ἄθλιος ἄνθρωπος οὐ πρότερον γεύεται, εἰμὴ πρότερον αὐτῷ καταράσαιο. —Euseb., "Eccl. Hist.," lib. vi., ch. xiii., p. 315.

'The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.' This rubric was transferred into the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1549) with the change of the form "preserve thy body" in giving the bread, and "preserve thy soul" in giving the cup, into the one form "preserve thy body and soul." In the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1552) the form was altered in favour of the formulæ, "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving"; "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." The direction to say the words "to every one" is omitted in the second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., thus apparently permitting a distribution to "railsful" at a time without individualizing the communicants. At the next revision, 1603, the two forms were combined into one, but the individual oblation was not provided for.

The reconstituted rubrics of 1661, which introduce the express words in the form of distribution "to any one," were probably the work of Archbishop Sancroft, at the time chaplain to Bishop Cosin. A copy of the Book of Common Prayer, annotated by Sancroft, is to be found in the Bodleian Library, with these words, "When he delivereth the Sacrament of the body of Christ to any one, he shall say," etc. "And when the minister delivereth the cup to any one, he shall say," etc. We may note from this the care that possessed our Reformers that the clergy in giving the Communion should use a set form of words, and that these words should be said to each communicant separately. If for a time, whether by oversight or otherwise, the rubric directing the saying of the formula of donation to each communicant individually was omitted, the Prayer-Book as it finally came forth from the hands of the revisers in the seventeenth century carefully preserves this feature. When we consider the circumstances under which the words "to any one" were introduced in 1661, it makes more plain the mind of the Church of England. In reply to objections, the Bishops said: "It is most requisite that the minister deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand and repeat the words in the singular number, for so much as it is the propriety of Sacraments to make particular oblation to each believer, and it is our visible profession that by the grace of God Christ tasted death for every man."¹ Among the Bishops who sat on the Commission we find the names of Sanderson, Pearson, Sparrow, Sheldon, etc. One of the objections made against the Prayer-

¹ Report of the Commissioners, p. 126.

Book by the Lincoln ministers in 1605 was: "That the words of the institution are to be pronounced and repeated to every several communicant." The objections were republished in 1641. According to Baxter, it was to be left optional to the minister whether he was to deliver the bread and wine to the people in general, each one taking for himself, or to deliver them generally, or to put them into every one's hand.¹

It may now be interesting to glance at the use of some of the Reformed Continental Churches in this matter. We find that in the office published by Luther in 1523 it seems to have been left an open question. The *Agnus Dei* might be sung during the Communion, or a prayer said from the canon of the Roman Mass, or the words of administration might be used: "Corpus Domini, etc., custodiat animam meam, vel tuam in vitam æternam, et sanguis, etc., custodiat," etc. Archbishop Herman's Liturgy (1543), has a direction that at the presentation of the "body" the pastor should say: "Take and eat to your salvation the body of your Lord, which was given for you"; and at the presentation of the cup: "Take and drink to your salvation the blood of our Lord, which was shed for your sins"; but there is nothing to point out whether these words were to be said severally to each communicant. The Liturgy of Calvin is equally indistinct as to any regulation of the kind. He seems at first to have required the words of institution, as given by St. Paul, to be recited to each communicant, and then to have had this use given up, as being a source of delay in the administration.² The change, however, may have had a doctrinal significance. In the Liturgy for the Use of Strangers in Strasburg, the words of donation are required to be said to each communicant separately, but in the corresponding Liturgy of Frankfort there is no such direction. The Liturgy of the English in Geneva (1556), recommended by Calvin, directs some suitable Scripture to be read during the Communion, and that the communicants should distribute the elements among themselves. An English copy of this Liturgy was printed in 1641, and presented to Parliament. Knox's Liturgy likewise directs the communicants to distribute the elements among themselves. This, we need scarcely say, is the universal use among the Presbyterian Churches of the present day. They receive

¹ "The Reformation of the Liturgy," p. 54. It is to be observed that, in the Visitation queries of the Bishops in the seventeenth century, particular inquiry is frequently made as to whether the words of distribution are said to each communicant separately. These queries are published at large in Crosthwaite's "Historical Inquiry," where much interesting information on the subject of this paper is to be found.

² "Epist.," vol. viii., p. 206.

the elements after they are sanctified by the Word of God, and prayer from the minister, who first communicates himself, and then hands them on, repeating the words: "Take, eat; this is our Lord's body which is broken for you; do it in remembrance of Him"; and so with the cup. We may say that among all Protestant Nonconformist bodies a very similar use prevails in the distribution of the elements. The directory for public worship has this form: "I take this bread, and having given thanks, I break it and give it unto you. Take ye, eat ye. This is the body of Christ, which is broken for you. 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' I take this cup and give it unto you. This cup is the New Testament in the Blood of Christ, which is shed for the remission of the sins of many. Drink ye all of it." We say nothing here about the posture of receiving among Nonconformists, which is universally one of sitting, nor of the practice, in many of their churches, of the men and women communicating separately, as in the Swedish and Lutheran Churches generally. The conclusion to be drawn from the use in the Church of England is clearly set down by Hooker: "Seeing God by Sacraments doth apply in particular unto every man's person the grace which Himself hath provided for the benefit of all mankind, there is no cause why, administering the Sacraments, we should forbear to express that in our forms of speech which He by His Word and Gospel teacheth all to believe . . . whether Christ at His last supper did speak generally once to all, or to every one in particular, is a thing uncertain. His words . . . are no manifest proof that He spake but once unto all, which did then communicate, much less that we in speaking unto every communicant separately do amiss, although it were clear that we herein do otherwise than Christ did."¹ It remains to be said that in the Church of Ireland Book of Common Prayer there is a supplementary rubric that runs as follows: "When, by reason of numbers, it is inconvenient to address to each communicant separately the words appointed to be said on delivering the bread and the cup, the words may, with the consent of the Ordinary, be said once to as many as shall together kneel for receiving the Communion at the Holy Table: provided that the words shall be said separately to any communicant so desiring it."

J. A. CARR, LL.D.

¹ "Ecl. Pol.," bk. v. 68.